UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,253	10/20/2003	Randall E. Juenger	DC-05519	3858

7590 03/27/2007

Robert W. Holland
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
PO Box 203518
Austin, TX 78720

EXAMINER	
SPITTLE, MATTHEW D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2111	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/689,253	JUENGER, RANDALL E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew D. Spittle	2111	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/16/2006*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 – 22 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 14, 17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 1, 14, 17 and 21 recite, "...a multiplexer..." Examiner notes that the operation of the multiplexer (30) as described is contrary to the usual function of a multiplexer, in that a usual multiplexer has several inputs and only a single output. The multiplexer disclosed has multiple outputs, with a single input. For this reason, Examiner believes Applicant has meant to recite another type of selecting device, and for purposes of examination, will regard the claimed "multiplexer" as a "selector."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 – 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2) in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212) and with evidence provided by Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4).

Examiner notes that the publishing date of the DT4 reference does not meet 35 USC 102 requirements, however, DT2 does. DT4 is cited for providing more detailed information about the DT2 product. Since both describe the same product(s), the entire DT4 disclosure is presumed to be inherent in the DT2 reference.

Regarding claim 1, DT2 teach an information handling system comprising:

A housing (p. 3, see notebook computer housing);

Processing components disposed in the housing and operable to generate display information (Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in this art for notebook computers to have processing components which are disposed in the housing and operable to generate display information);

A graphics component interfaced with the processing components and operable to output the display information as a DVO signal (Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in this art for a notebook computer as disclosed to output display information, particularly as a DVO signal, since DVO signals provide a higher quality display (p. 13, see Digital DVI);

A selector interfaced with the graphics component to receive the DVO signal having first and second selectable outputs (Examiner notes that the software allows the outputs to be selected for use; p. 43, see "Checkbox: "Extend my Windows desktop..."";

A first DVI connector operable to provide the DVI output at the housing to an external display (p. 3, Notebook external monitor cable; Examiner takes official notice that it is well known for a notebook computer to have a DVI connector which attaches to a monitor cable);

A docking connector operable to provide the DVI output at the housing to a docking station (where the docking connector is interpreted as a PC card connector; p. 16).

DT2 fails to teach a first and second TMDS transmitter.

Acharya et al. teach that TMDS transmission is well-known for use with flat panel displays, and allows fewer wires to be used for image data lower power consumption, better protection against EMI, and higher transmission speeds (col. 12, line 59 – col. 13, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by Applicant to incorporate the TMDS transmitters of Acharya et al.

into the system of DT2 for the purpose of providing image data with fewer wires, lower power consumption, better protection against EMI, and higher transmission speeds. This would have been obvious to improve performance and make the system more reliable.

Regarding claim 2, DT2 teach the additional limitation of a docking station operable to couple to the housing and to accept the docking connector (where a docking station is interpreted as the combination of the Notebook/Sidecar PC Card interface cable and the SideCar PlusTwo unit; p. 3);

A second DVI connector interfaced with the docking connector and operable to provide the DVI output at the docking station to an external display (p.3, SideCar monitor cables; Examiner takes official notice that it is well known for a device that attaches to a monitor cable to have a cable connector).

Regarding claim 3, DT2 teach the additional limitation comprising:

A docking station detector operable to determine inserting of the information handling system into the docking station (p. 24 – 28);

A switch interfaced with the docking station detector and the selector and operable to select the first TMDS transmitter if the housing is not coupled to the docking station and to select the second TMDS transmitter if the housing is coupled to the docking station (Examiner notes that the software allows the outputs to be selected for use; p. 43, see “Checkbox: “Extend my Windows desktop…””; This means would

appear to allow any monitor coupled externally to the notebook computer to be selected and de-selected, whether or not the housing is coupled to the SideCar (docking station)).

Regarding claim 8, DT2 teach the additional limitation comprising a display monitor operable to interface with the second DVI connector to present the display information when the housing is coupled to the docking station (p. 3, see monitor #3).

* * *

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2) in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212) and with evidence provided by Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4) and Barlow et al. (U.S. 6,311,263).

Regarding claim 4, DT2 fails to explicitly teach wherein the selector and the first and second TMDS transmitters are fabricated as an application specific integrated circuit. Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in this art to use an ASIC to implement some logic function as evidenced by Barlow et al. (col. 20, lines 57 – 63), since ASIC devices are low cost and have low power consumption.

* * *

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2) in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212) and with evidence provided by Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4) and Merkin et al. (U.S. 6,584,561).

Regarding claim 5, DT2 fails to explicitly teach wherein the graphics component comprises a graphics and memory controller hub. Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in this art for a computer system, such as a notebook computer, to contain a graphics and memory controller hub, as evidenced by Merkin et al. (col. 3, lines 38 – 42).

Regarding claim 6, DT2 fails to explicitly teach wherein the graphics component comprises a graphics processor unit. Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in this art for a computer system, such as a notebook computer, to contain a graphics processor unit, as evidenced by Merkin et al. (col. 3, lines 38 – 42; Fig. 1, 130).

* * *

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2) in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212) and with evidence provided by Digital Tigers SideCar

PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4) and Merril (U.S. Pub. 2002/0036694).

Regarding claim 7, DT2 fails to explicitly teach a projector. Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known in this art to use a projector with a DVI connector for the purposes of presenting display information. This is evidenced by Merril (par. 116).

* * *

Claims 9 – 22 are directed to a method and a system with substantially similar limitations as in claims 1 – 8 above and are rejected under the same grounds.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew D. Spittle whose telephone number is (571) 272-2467. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 571-272-3632. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MDS

MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100